

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons:

1. Oath/Declaration

Attached is a new declaration signed by the Inventor in the correct "Signature" field, as required in item 1 on page 2 of the Official Action.

2. Objections to Drawings

The objections to the drawings have been addressed by revising the block descriptions to better indicate the relationships between the decision blocks the corresponding action blocks, and by adding primes to distinguish the reference numerals, and by amending the specification to refer to the "primed" reference numbers (103', 104', 106', 106'', 106''', 107', 108').

In addition, the omitted Y's and N's have been added, thereby correcting each of the informalities noted in items 2-8 on pages 2 and 3 of the Official Action.

Because all of the amendments to the drawings are formal in nature, it is respectfully submitted that they do not involve new matter.

3. Objection to Specification

This objection has been addressed by changing Ref. "e" (second instance) to Ref. -g-, as suggested in item 9 on page 4 of the Official Action. In addition, the specification and claims have been amended to correct various minor idiomatic and grammatical errors.

Again, because all of the amendments are formal in nature, it is respectfully submitted that they do not involve new matter.

4. Rejection of Claims 1-5 and 7-10 Under 35 USC §102(e) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,487,424 (Kraft)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Kraft patent neither discloses nor suggests a process for performing **arithmetic and engineering based arithmetic operations** in a mobile phone, in which both arithmetic and engineering based arithmetic operation software is stored in the phone and an appropriate input interface is read from the memory of the phone in response to selection of one of the software programs.

The Kraft patent discloses a display method involving display of entered information and display of information candidates that can be selected. The present invention makes use of this data entry method, which in fact is commonly used in cell phones and other small electronic devices that lack a full size keyboard. However, the Kraft patent does not disclose execution of selected arithmetic and engineering software programs, as claimed. At best, Kraft discloses that a cell phone can be used as a calculator, and that characters can be selected from an on-screen display. This is no different than the “prior art” discussed on page 1 of Applicant’s own specification.

The Kraft patent merely concerns display and selection of different character sets, including Western and Chinese characters, numbers, and various very simple arithmetic operators. The display of the character sets does not involve selection of different arithmetic operation displays (simple or engineering), as claimed, or performing calculations on the inputted operands and operator, as also claimed. There is no suggestion in Kraft that its display method can possibly be used to facilitate use of a mobile phone as a simple calculator and as an engineering calculator.

On page 6 of the Official Action, the Examiner alleges that Kraft discloses the concept of using engineering based arithmetic operation software in a mobile phone. In reply, the Applicant respectfully submits that the passages cited by the Examiner do not disclose this concept. The passages cited by the Examiner simply point out that the data entry method

disclosed by Kraft “*may be useful for a calculator integrated in, e.g. a cellular phone*” (col. 12, line 15). Nowhere does the Kraft patent disclose storage of multiple arithmetic operation programs in the memory of the phone, including an engineering based arithmetic operation software program. In col. 12, lines 19-24, Kraft mentions “*four basic mathematical operators*,” an equal sign, a decimal point, memory functions, a percent sign, a change of sign, and “*some currency conversion operations*.” None of the functions mentioned by Kraft correspond to the claimed engineering based arithmetic operations.

As a result, the Kraft patent clearly does not anticipate the claimed invention, and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-5 and 7-10 under 35 USC §102(e) is respectfully requested.

5. Rejection of Claim 6 Under 35 USC §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,487,424 (Kraft) and 5,870,319 (Thornton)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Thornton patent, like the Kraft patent, fails to disclose or suggest, whether considered individually or in combination with any of the references of record, a process for performing **arithmetic and engineering based arithmetic operations** in a mobile phone, in which both arithmetic and engineering based arithmetic operation software is stored in the phone and an appropriate input interface is read from the memory of the phone in response to selection of one of the software programs, and which involves display of operators or operands and performing calculations on the inputted operands and operator, as claimed. Instead, the Thornton patent is directed to a method of displaying and manipulating graphs on a dedicated scientific calculator.

Furthermore, while the calculator of Thornton appears to have the capability of switching between degrees and radians (as do most scientific calculators, the switch is not accomplished by pressing a switch button (normally used for volume control) on a mobile telephone. Like Kraft, Thornton does not even remotely suggest that its display method can possibly be used to facilitate use of a mobile phone as a simple calculator or an engineering calculator.

Because neither the Kraft patent nor the Thornton patent, whether considered individually or in any reasonable combination, discloses a cell phone/calculator/engineering calculator combination as claimed, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 6 under 35 USC §103(a) is requested.

B. S.